



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

until one came from home, from Tübingen, which had passed from under the control of the rationalists, who had twice rejected him, into the hands of evangelical men. F. C. Baur still drew many hearers, but so did Beck and Oehler who were believers in inspiration. So strong was the new sentiment that Oehler could lay aside his polemical weapons that had been in constant use at Breslau. Oehler had the highest conception of the duties of a theological professor. With a narrow conscience he possessed a broad heart. Without the aid of speculation and conjecture and doubt, likewise free from parenthetical homilies, he held the attention by his exact learning, his eager enthusiasm and his devout spirit, as he sought to restore the Old Testament to the place of honor from which Schleiermacher sought to remove it, the place of the indispensable historical and doctrinal foundation of the New Testament. The highest compliment a professor of theology can receive, he used to say, is to hear his pupils exclaim, "Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Savior of the world."

From 1852 for nearly twenty years he toiled in the field of Old Testament literature at Tübingen. He published little but review articles. His great works on Old Testament Theology and Symbolics are posthumous. He lectured up to the day before his fatal sickness. From his dying bed he sent word to his pupils in Job that he had "now experienced the contents of that book, and by faith could solve the riddle of suffering that remained a mystery to the patriarch." He said he understood the psalms better than he did, and he called the 130th his own. He often sighed, "I want to go home," and on his grave stone at his request was inscribed: "There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God." Thus ended the life of one whom Delitzsch has called, "a theologian after God's heart."

W. W. EVERTS, JR.,

*Philadelphia.*

---

**Throwing the Slipper.**—Not long since, in a railroad train with a friend, having the January number of the *Century* I was interested in reading some sketches from the letters of the lamented President Garfield, from London. On the voyage out a question arose between him and a certain Dr. H., a fellow-passenger, on the meaning of the custom of throwing the slipper after a newly married couple. Dr. H. thought the custom was "taken from the Bible, wherein a shoe is considered the symbol of a good wife." (We would have been interested in seeing the proof passage for this.) Garfield quoted Ps. LX., 8., "'Over Edom will I cast my shoe,' which," he said, "he had always regarded as a malediction." The statesman was much nearer the truth than the theologian; but still, I think *renunciation* is the word which, more nearly than *malediction*, expresses the meaning of the act, as we have it in the Scriptures, and as I have often witnessed it in the East. A father, for instance, who would renounce his son, after he has been convicted of being a wicked son, will, before witnesses, take off his shoe, and, if near enough, strike him with it, or, if more distant, throw it at him. Recently we have had three cases of Moslem converts to Christianity whose relatives and co-religionists have, in this manner, signified their renunciation and cutting off of all relations with the perverts from their faith. The oriental shoe, being usually a soft slipper, is not thrown as a missile, or weapon with which to strike a person, for the purpose of causing bodily pain. Losing sight of this distinction, one of our missionary brethren had his veracity, or at least trustworthiness, called in

question in one of the above cases. He sent us a telegram, stating that a young Moslem, who had professed Christianity, had been beaten and imprisoned by the authorities. Passing the telegram over to Sir Evelyn Baring, the British Consul General here, he had the young man sent for, who, on examination, denied having been beaten. This led Sir Evelyn to request us to read our young brother in the distant station a lecture on the importance of being sure of his facts before telegraphing. When the convert came to us, on being cross-questioned, he again denied having been *beaten*; but, on being told to relate fully all that took place, he said that, among the other indignities to which he was subjected, his father struck him with his shoe before the sub-governor. The Arabic has only one word for *beat* or *strike*; and our brother, to spare words in his telegram, had left out the phrase "with his shoe."

This explains the throwing of the slipper after the bride, as she leaves her father's house. It is saying to her, in a playful way, "Be off with you. We renounce you, and will have nothing more to do with you." It also explains the transaction in Ruth iv., and the law in Deuteronomy xxv., 7-9, upon which it is founded, concerning which I see much in the commentaries that is quite wide of the mark. Their mistakes are chiefly founded upon the misapprehension that the loosing of the shoe is simply a form of legal process for the transfer of property. This is merely a secondary idea. Beneath the law in Deuteronomy there is a substratum of social prescription, private prejudice and, probably, personal antipathy (which it is much more easy for us in the East to understand, than to explain to you in the West), which, in the majority of cases, would make the brother-in-law not "like" at all to take his brother's wife, while he would be quite prepared to take his full share of his brother's inheritance. Just here the divine law steps in, as it always does, in the interest of the *weaker party*, and gives the widow the right to go up to the gate (the place of justice), unto the elders of the city, and say, "My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel. He will not perform the duty of my husband's brother." This accusation made it obligatory upon the elders of the city to summon him and "speak unto him" (that is, expostulate with him, and take his formal, final word in the matter), and if he stood to it and said, "I like not to take her," then it was her privilege to come up to him, in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot, and, moreover, it was her privilege not only to hand him the shoe, demanding that he should throw it after her, in token of formal legal renunciation, but it was her right also to express her contempt of him by spitting in his face and saying, "So shall it be done unto that man who will not build up his brother's house;" and he and his family were forced thereafter to bear the reproach in Israel, "The house of him that had his shoe loosed."

The difference of circumstances in the case of Ruth explains why it was the kinsman himself who "drew off his shoe." He did not venture to throw it at Ruth, nor strike with it that chaste widow. She was, probably, not present, though iii., 18 does not conclusively show this. Boaz was her competent deputy. Some of the commentators, as, e. g., Lange and the Speaker's, supplement the record of the act by saying that he handed the shoe to Boaz. The text does not say he did so, and I do not think he did. The general statement of the Levirate law in the preceding verse led them to conclude that he did; but all parties were so well agreed in this case, that there was no desire to inflict an act of contempt, and the mere drawing off of the shoe, or even feigning to do so, was sufficient.

It was tantamount to a testator putting his finger upon the seal appended to a will, and declaring, in the presence of witnesses, that this is his last will and testament. So the other act, implying not only renunciation, but contempt, viz., that of spitting, is often only performed in pantomime, the person performing only saying to the other "p'thew upon thee," without actually spitting upon him. As above intimated, there was no desire in this case to express contempt. Had there been, Ruth should have been present to act the part. But in Ps. LX., 8, the contemptuous shade of meaning is evident from the connection, and so the Arabs now often say, "My shoe at you."

G. LANSING,  
*Alexandria, Egypt.*

---

**Use of Wine by the Jews.**—The author of the *Bibliographical Notes* in the preceding number of the OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, the Rev. J. W. Haley closes his article, p. 122, with a thought which is deserving of being taken to heart. He says, "Every Christian minister should carefully study modern Judaism, as represented by those writers who are thoroughly versed in the subject." It is now unfortunate in him to have directed the attention of the students of Judaism to writers who are *not* versed at all in the subject. The books which he describes in his *Notes* are, probably without any exception, the merest trash. A glance at the *tohu wabohu* of their contents, as the same is indicated in the Notes of the Rev. Mr. Haley, is alone sufficient to show that their writers were of illogical and perfectly confused minds. To one who is more or less familiar with the life and literature of the Jews, it is also clear upon one glance from the headings of the chapters and from the little we see quoted by Mr. Haley, that the authors are not entitled to consideration by scholarly minds seeking after truth. *Such* books must be totally ignored. For instead of giving information and enlightenment upon modern Judaism, they mislead and misinform.

From several of the books described by him, the Rev. J. W. Haley quotes passages according to which Jews are abstainers from wine; at least on the Passover festival. Here is cumulative evidence, some may think, showing this to be so. But it is not so. The truth lies almost in the opposite direction. Very old laws, going back to Ante-Christian times, command it as a religious duty to the pious Jew, to drink four cups of fermented grape wine on Passover eve, even when during the balance of the year he would not drink a drop of wine, be it on account of a natural dislike of wine, be it on account of poverty (in such a case the poor Israelite had to be sufficiently supported from the charity funds of the congregation in order to enable him to buy his wine, see Mishnah P'saḥim, X., 1.), be it for any reason whatsoever. In later ages, the Casuists granted it as an indulgence to use raisin mixtures and other similar beverages in case *Kasher fermented grape wine could not be procured*.

While in fact grape wine *is* used at the Passover festival by the strict and law-abiding Jews, some other drinks, as beer, ale, rye whiskey, are avoided by them during the festive week. And why? Because they are made by a process of fermentation from one or the other of the five kinds of grain (rye, wheat, spelt, barley, oats) out of which fermented bread, or leavened bread, is produced. And on the Hag hammatzoth (the feast of unleavened bread) no leavened or fermented bread, nor any other production from the said kinds of grain, except Matzmoth, should be used by Israelites.